

REMARKS

In the Office Action of February 28, 2007, the Examiner indicated that Applicant failed to respond to the rejection of claims 87, 89, and 91-93 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner has given Applicant an additional 30 days to correct this omission and supply a response to the outstanding rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 87, 89, and 91-93 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Specifically, for claims 87 and 89, the Examiner objected to the term "derived". Applicant traverses this rejection.

Applicant states that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what Applicant means by the term "derived" in claims 87 and 89. The meaning of the term is clearly spelled out in the specification from page 26, line 30 to page 31, line 24. The phrase "derived from Borrelia Osp C protein" means that there is a sequence homology between the claimed peptide sequence and the Osp C protein sequence. The sequence could be a fragment, or a portion of the OsP C protein, which is sufficient to elicit an immune reaction. The meaning of the term is clear in view of the specification and claims, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner also objected to claims 87, 89, and 91-93, because it was unclear how formula III was connected with > S and what it represented. Applicant submits that formula III is depicted in Applicant's Response of November

20, 2006 in Attachment A at Figures 6 and 7. Formula III is a schematic representation of the styrene bead (S) where one of the two polypeptide chains has been activated with a dicarboxylic acid moiety (R) $[\text{HOOC-R-CO-HN-A-CO}]_b$, and the other adjacent polypeptide chain has not been activated $[\text{H}_2\text{N-A-CO}]_{a-b}$, because of the addition of about half of an equivalent of dicarboxylic acid for each peptide chain. This is clearly depicted as the second diagram in Figure 6, and the first diagram in Figure 7 of Attachment A of the November 20, 2006 Response. As such, Applicant believes that the claims are not indefinite and those of ordinary skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of Applicant's claims. Applicant therefore requests withdrawal of this rejection.

No new matter has been added by this Response. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By 

Joseph G. Contrera
Reg. No. 44,678

400 Seventh St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 638-6666
Date: March 28, 2007

HBJ:JGC:

R:\gmills\JGC\Zacco\P63882US1- Supp resp to OA for 112 rej.doc